

PR-4



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,845	03/12/2001	Sam J. DiRaimondo	CM01891G	1286
22917	7590	10/03/2003	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA, INC. 1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD IL01/3RD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			PHAN, RAYMOND NGAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2181	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n No.

09/803,845

Applicant(s)

DIRAIMONDO ET AL.

Examin r

Raymond Phan

Art Unit

2181

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n th cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7, 10 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: .

### **Part III DETAILED ACTION**

#### ***Notice to Applicant(s)***

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-20 are pending.
2. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 2181.

#### ***Specification***

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al. (US No. 6,450,407) in view of Teicher et al. (US No. 6,257,486).

In regard to claim 1, Freeman et al. disclose a method of regulating usage in a smart card system comprising at a card acceptance location (see col. 15, lines 40-53); detecting the presence of the card (see col. 15, lines 40-52); determining an ID code from the smart card (see col. 16, line 52 through col. 17, line 4). But

Freeman et al. do not specifically disclose the checking the ID code against a list stored locally at the card acceptance location, wherein the list is received from a second device; and if the ID code of the smart card is listed on the list, performing an action on the smart card. However Teicher et al. disclose the checking the ID code against a list stored locally at the card acceptance location, wherein the list is received from a second device (see figure 11, col. 14, lines 19-38); and if the ID code of the smart card is listed on the list, performing an action on the smart card (see figure 12, col. 14, lines 39-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Teicher et al. within the system of Freeman et al. because it would improve security of database system.

In regard to claim 2, Freeman et al. disclose the step of modifying the parameter of the card (see col. 12, lines 5-36). But Freeman et al. do not disclose wherein the action is selected from a group of consisting of disabling the smart card, enabling the smart card. However Teicher et al. disclose the action is selected from a group of consisting of disabling the smart card, enabling the smart card (see figure 12, col. 14, lines 39-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Teicher et al. within the system of Freeman et al. because it would improve security of database system.

In regard to claim 3, Teicher et al. explicitly disclose wherein the smart card has a status bit, wherein the action performed is disabling the smart card that comprises at least one of the step (see col. 14, lines 39-64): changing the status bit in the smart card to indicate disable see col. 14, lines 39-64); and blocking an area of memory located within the smart card (see col. 14, lines 39-64). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Teicher et al. within the system of Freeman et al. because it would improve security of database system.

In regard to claim 4, Teicher et al. explicitly disclose wherein the smart card has a status bit, wherein the action performed is enabling the smart card that comprises at least one of the step (see col. 14, lines 39-64): changing the status bit in the smart card to indicate enable (see col. 14, lines 39-64); and unblocking an area of memory located within the smart card (see col. 14, lines 39-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Teicher et al. within the system of Freeman et al. because it would improve security of database system.

In regard to claim 8, Freeman et al. disclose wherein the action performed is modifying parameter to the smart card which indicates discounts, rebate, purchase (see col. 7, lines 15-35).

In regard to claim 9, Freeman et al. disclose wherein the parameter is based on at least loyalty program, type of concession (see col. 7, lines 15-59).

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 12-20 are allowable over the prior of records.

7. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 12 is allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art, found any motivation to combine any of the said prior arts which teach a method of regulating smart card usage in smart card system comprising the step of

compiling a first list of smart cards; transmitting the first list to a set of smart card acceptance locations, wherein the first list is stored locally at each card acceptance location in the set; receiving a second list of smart cards from each card acceptance location in the set, wherein the card acceptance location has performed an action on each smart card listed on its respective second list; if the smart card is listed on the second list and the first list, purging the smart card from the first list; and if the smart card is listed on the second list but not listed on the first list, adding the smart card to the first list.

8. The remaining claims, not specifically mentioned, is allowed for the same reason as set for claims 1, 8, 13 and 16.

9. Claims 5-7, 10-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Features of claims 5-7, 10-11 are allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art, found any motivation to combine any of the said prior arts which teach the step of determining if the smart card was previously disabled before the step of checking the identification code against a list stored locally at the card acceptance location (claim 5); wherein the step of checking the identification code against a list stored locally at the card acceptance location only if the smart card was determined to be previously disabled (claim 6); the step of, only after the step of performing is completed, transmitting a request to the second device to

purge the identification code of the smart card that the action was performed on from the list (claim 7); wherein the list comprises identification code of smart cards that are selected from a group consisting of smart cards deemed ineligible to participate in the smart card system; smart cards were previously denied access to participate in the smart card system but are currently deemed eligible to participate in the smart card system; and smart cards that require a concession update (claim 10); wherein the smart card has a status bit and blocking status comprising the step of determining whether the status bit and the blocking status are consistent, if the status bit and the block status are inconsistent, disabling the smart card (claim 11).

### ***Conclusion***

11. Claims 1-4, 8-10 are rejected. Claims 5-7 and 10-11 are objected. Claims 12-20 are allowed.

12. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**Dean et al. (US No. 6,023,762)** disclose a multi-view personalized communication agent.

**Murphy et al. (US No. 6,226,744)** disclose a method and apparatus for authenticating users on the network using a smart card.

**Daigneault et al. (US No. 6,374,356)** disclose a shared intelligence automated access control system.

**Freeman et al. (US No. 6,068,183)** disclose a chip card system.

**Pitroda (US No. 5,884,271)** discloses a device, system and method of conducting paperless transactions.

**Tello (US No. 6,463,537)** disclose a modified computer motherboard security and identification system.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (703) 306-2756. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Primary, Paul Myers can be reached on (703) 305-9656 or via e-mail addressed to paul.myers@uspto.gov. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 746-7239.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



PAUL R. MYERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER



**Raymond Phan**  
9/25/03